

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Applicant's undersigned representative met with Examiner Dewanda Samuel on July 21, 2009 to discuss the status of the present application.

During the interview, the rejection of claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 16, 17, 23, 27, 27, 35, 36, 38, 40, 42-45, 47, 48, 51-53 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 over Rom (US 6360743), Lefkowitz (US 6990343), Dorenbosch (US 6850503), Backes (US 2004/0166870), and Hunkeler (US 6940655) was discussed. The potential rejection of the independent method claims and computer-readable medium claims was also discussed with respect to 35 U.S.C. § 101. A potential restriction requirement of the application was discussed.

The Examiner indicated that amending the independent method claims to further define an apparatus performing the features of the claims would overcome the rejections of record and any potential rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The Examiner further indicated that amending the specification to omit any reference to carrier waves would overcome any potential rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 with regard to the computer-readable medium claims. The Examiner further agreed that the reference Backes does not qualify as prior art against the subject application. The Examiner agreed to consider a possible restriction requirement of the claims.

Applicant has adopted the Examiner's suggestions.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.2, 1.133 and MPEP § 713.04.